sition, but at the same time he also said that Opposition should not go on hampering and obstructing the functioning of Parliament. Opposition should not always try to interrupt the functioning of the State. This was his statement in this house as a Chariman. I pay my tributes to Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan as a great, teacher, a great philosopher and a great statesman.

Thank you.

## WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

**Recovery of amounts from drug companies as arrears of land revenue.**

461. SHRI M. KADHARSHA :
SHRI RANJNI RANJAN SAHU :

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state :

(a) Whether any intimation to the Collector to recover the amount due from any drug company as arrears of land revenue was subsequently withdrawn;

(b) What are the reasons therefor and what is the name of the concerned company and the amount involved;

(c) Whether it is a fact that the cheque sent by M/s. Warner Hindustan as partial payment was returned and the Collector was advised to go ahead with the recovery proceedings: and

(d) If so, what are the reasons for following different yardsticks for different companies?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO):

(a) and (b) : The Collector, Bombay was asked to stay the use of coercive process for recovery of amount due from the following companies involved in the Supreme Court judgement as arrears of land revenue after these companies had made part payment.

(Rs. in lakhs)

| Name of the Company | Amount due |
|---|---|
| 1. M/s. Pfizer Ltd. | 48.21 |
| 2. M/s. Geoffrey Manners & Co. Ltd. | 28.37 |
| 3. M/s. John Wyeth (India) Ltd. | 133.46 |

(Amount assessed finally by the special team).

(c) The amount of Rs. 1,06,36, 255.44 was assessed to be due from M/s. Warner Hindustan Ltd. on account of overcharging the prices of some drugs. The company disputed the amount and sent a Cheque for Rs. 30.11 lakhs. This was not accepted by the Government and the Cheque was returned and the company was asked to pay the full amount. The Bombay High Court has subsequently stayed the collection.

(d) The three companies referred to in part (b) subsequently made part payments pending the finali-

sation of the amount due from them. M/s. Warner Hindustan Ltd. had disputed the amount calculated.

**Price fixation of Anti-TB drugs**

*462. SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU:

DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI :

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that his Ministry has fixed leader prices for a number of packs of anti-TB formulations;

(b) if so, what are the prices fixed for each leader pack and what is the extent of reduction/increase in each case;

(c) whether the manufacturers have complied with the reduced prices and the names of those who are yet to implement the reduced prices;

(d) whether the prices of non-leader packs of anti-TB formulations are yet to be fixed and by when the prices of non-leader packs would be fixed; and

(e) since when the overcharging is going on at the cost of the poor TB patients?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO) : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The details of ceiling prices fixed for various anti-TB formulations under DPCO, 1987 are given in the Annexure [*See* Appendix CXLVII, Annexure No. 147]

(c) No specific case of non-compliance of the ceiling prices fixed by the Government by the manufacturers of formulations concerned has come to notice.

(d) Revision of prices of various non-leader formulations under the DPCO, 1987 shall be considered when the concerned manufacturers seek such a revision.

(e) In view of the reply given in (c) and (d) does not arise.

**Prices of Actilex syrup and Actidil tablets**

*463. PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA : DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI :

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 351 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 22nd August, 1988 and state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the price of Actilex Syrup 115ml. before commencement of DPCO, 1987 was Rs 4.51 per bottle as per Indian Pharmaceutical Guide 1987 which is being subscribed by his Ministry;

(b) if so, on what basis the price of Rs.7.52 has been mentioned in reply to the question referred to above;

(c) whether it is also a fact that there is 257 per cent increase in Actidil Tablets based an Triprolidine which is a leading brand;